

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

SEAN RONDELL BUNDY,

Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent

* * * * *

**CIVIL NO. JKB-14-0221
CRIMINAL NO. JKB-08-0226**

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

Pending before the Court is Sean Rondell Bundy’s “Motion for Extention [*sic*] of Time to File a Motion for Reconsideration.” (ECF No. 329.) On July 18, 2018, the Court entered its order denying Bundy’s motion to vacate his sentence pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. (ECF No. 320.) His court-appointed attorney filed a notice of appeal the same day. (ECF No. 321.) On July 30, 2018, Bundy *pro se* filed a piece of correspondence that referred to a motion for reconsideration. (ECF No. 327.) The Court construed it as such and denied it on August 6. (ECF No. 328.) On the same day, Bundy filed the instant motion.

Although he does not cite the basis for his future motion for reconsideration, the Court interprets his current motion as one requesting the Court extend the time for filing a motion under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) to alter or amend the Court’s order denying his motion for § 2255 relief. The Court is without any authority to grant an extension for filing a Rule 59(e) motion. Rule 6(b)(2) prohibits such. The deadline for filing a Rule 59(e) motion is 28 days from the entry of the Court’s order, as stated by that rule. *See United States v. Griffin*, 397 F. App’x 902, 903 (4th Cir. 2010) (*per curiam*) (unpublished) (district court was without

power to enlarge time for filing Rule 59(e) motion (citing *Panhorst v. United States*, 241 F.3d 367, 370 (4th Cir. 2001)).

The motion is DENIED. The Clerk shall send a copy of this memorandum and order to Bundy at the address he has on file with the Court and provide a copy to all counsel of record.

DATED this 9th day of August, 2018.

BY THE COURT:

_____/s/_____
James K. Bredar
Chief Judge